

### REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the patent to Piette, et al.

At the same time, the Examiner indicated that claims 3 and 4 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner's indication of the allowability of some claims has been gratefully acknowledged. In connection with this, claim 3 has been canceled and its features have been introduced into claim 1. It is therefore believed that claim 1 should be considered as being in allowable condition.

Claim 4 has been amended to depend on the amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 4, together with claims 2, 5, and 6 which depend on claim 1 and share its allowable features, should also be considered as being in allowable condition.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application with all the claims currently on file is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233